

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * * * *

FRANK ORTIZ,)
vs. Plaintiff,) 3:05-cv-00113-LRH-VPC
DAVID KELLY, et al.,) ORDER
Defendants.)
-----)

Before the court is Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate Judge Cooke's Denial of Docket Document No. 59 and Striking of Document No. 58 (#64¹); Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate's Grant in Part of His Motion for Enlargement (sic) of Time Dated November 7, 2006, and Reply to Defendants' Untimely Opposition to Motion to Add Defendants (#65), and Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate's November 7, 2006, Denial of Docket Nos. 60 & 61 (#67), all of which the court will treat as oppositions to the Magistrate's Order (#62).

The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's opposition, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes that the Magistrate Judge's rulings are neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

///

///

///

///

¹Refers to this court's docket number.

1 The Magistrate Judge's Order (#62) will, therefore, be sustained.
2
3 IT IS SO ORDERED.
4
5 DATED this 3rd day of August, 2007.



6
7 LARRY R. HICKS
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28